

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the above amendments and following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 are pending in the present application. By this amendment, Claims 1, 7, 9 and 11 are amended; and no claims are canceled or added herewith. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added by this amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 10 and 11 were objected to; Claims 1 and 3-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2,608,472 to Flosdorf; and Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Flosdorf in view of SU 1535565 Russian Publication to Aleksandro .

Regarding the objection to Claims 10 and 11, the claims are amended by the present amendment. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to Claims 10 and 11 is respectfully requested.

With respect to the rejection of Claims 1 and 3-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Flosdorf, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The independent claims recite a housing configured to contain a solid material, a heater for heating the housing to liquefy the solid material, at least one rotatable evaporation roller configured to gather liquefied solid material on a surface of the roller and to evaporate the liquefied solid material from the surface of the roller, and at least one rotatable precipitation roller configured to precipitate the evaporated material from a surface and the roller. The applied art does not disclose all the features recited above.

Specifically, Flosdorf discloses that a material is directly evaporated (sublimated) by use of stirring vanes (agitator) in a cylinder and then the material is returned to a solid again. As such, the state of the material to be purified and the method thereof are different from those recited in the claimed invention, which is a liquefied material. That is, in Flosdorf, the

solid material is directly sublimated and therefore dust will be formed at the time of evaporation. Accordingly, a filter is used to prevent incorporation of the dust into the purified solid. In contrast, according to the claimed invention, since the solid material is liquefied and then evaporated, the problem associated with the dust does not occur.

Additionally, Flosdorf discloses that the evaporation and solidification are carried out by use of stirring vanes within the cylinder. This is different from that of exemplary embodiments of the present invention in which the evaporation and solidification are carried out on the surface of a roller.

Further, it is noted that changing the evaporating roller 12 with the precipitation roller 19 in Flosdorf would render the device of Flosdorf inoperable because steam is supplied to the cavity 11 to vaporize the substance and the substance to be vaporized is also supplied to the same cavity 11 in which the evaporation roller should be placed and not the precipitation roller 19. If the position of the precipitation roller is physically changed in Flosdorf, so that the precipitation roller becomes diagonally above the evaporation roller 10, Applicants respectfully submit that the duct 14, filter chamber 15 and all the pipes 32-40 would have to be modified in Flosdorf to accommodate that change, not to mention that the operation principle of the apparatus of Flosdorf would change. Applicants respectfully submit that when the precipitation roller is below the evaporation roller, the evaporated substance cannot raise to deposit on the precipitation roller to precipitate, thus changing the operation principle of the claimed device.

Aleksandro does not make up for the deficiencies of Flosdorf discussed above nor does the Office Action particularly assert as such. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of the claims based on the teachings of Flosdorf and/or Aleksandro is the result of hindsight reconstruction in view of the teachings of the present specification, and is improper. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1 and 7 and


dependent Claims 2-6 and 11 patentably distinguish over the applied art. Withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Consequently, for the reasons discussed in detail above, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25, 599

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 03/06)

Kevin M. McKinley
Registration No. 43,794